

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL



Published in Accordance with
General Statutes Section 51-216a

VOL. LXXX No. 5

July 31, 2018

267 Pages

Table of Contents

CONNECTICUT REPORTS

Callaghan v. Car Parts International, LLC, 329 C 564.	12
<i>Workers' compensation; whether Compensation Review Board properly upheld decision of workers' compensation commissioner that defendant employer was entitled to moratorium against paying plaintiff's future workers' compensation benefits; whether moratorium applied to proceeds that plaintiff retained under statute (§ 31-293 (a)) providing that, if employee brings action against third-party tortfeasor, one-third of employer's claim to those proceeds inures solely to employee's benefit; whether application of moratorium conflicted with and undermined purpose and plain language of § 31-293 (a); whether legislative history of § 31-293 (a) confirmed that legislature intended for employee alone to retain benefit of one-third reduction; claim that moratorium should apply to one-third reduction to avoid double recovery by employee.</i>	
D'Attilo v. Statewide Grievance Committee, 329 C 624.	72
<i>Writ of mandamus; whether trial court properly granted defendants' motion to dismiss action for lack of subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiffs, as complainants in attorney disciplinary proceeding, lack standing to seek court intervention in grievance process; claim that trial court improperly declined to exercise inherent authority to oversee attorney conduct; adoption of trial court's memorandum of decision as proper statement of facts and applicable law.</i>	
Eubanks v. Commissioner of Correction, 329 C 584	32
<i>Habeas corpus; claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; whether Appellate Court improperly reached merits of petitioner's claim that trial counsel rendered constitutionally ineffective assistance of counsel in failing to object on basis of double hearsay to admission of certain portions of transcript from prior court hearing that contained testimony of unavailable witness; whether petitioner distinctly raised claim in habeas court on which Appellate Court determined that trial counsel's performance was objectively unreasonable; claim that Appellate Court decision could be affirmed on alternative ground that Appellate Court correctly concluded that trial counsel's failure to object on basis of double hearsay was objectively unreasonable.</i>	
Hickey v. Commissioner of Correction, 329 C 605	53
<i>Habeas corpus; claim of ineffective assistance of counsel; whether failure of petitioner's trial counsel to request instructions limiting jury's consideration of certain uncharged sexual misconduct evidence to issue of propensity resulted in prejudice to petitioner; whether Appellate Court properly remanded case to habeas court for further proceedings.</i>	
State v. Roszkowski, 329 C 554	2
<i>Murder; capital felony; criminal possession of firearm; death sentence; claim that defendant should not have been subjected to second penalty phase hearing because imposition of death penalty became unconstitutional upon enactment of P.A. 12-5 and because trial court improperly denied defendant's request for reexamination of his competency; claim that trial court improperly merged defendant's three murder convictions with his corresponding capital felony convictions; whether defendant's appellate claims related to his death sentence and to procedures by which that sentence was imposed were moot or unripe; whether trial court should have vacated defendant's murder convictions.</i>	
Volume 329 Cumulative Table of Cases	97

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT APPELLATE REPORTS

- Abrams v. PH Architects, LLC, 183 CA 777 55A
Contracts; professional negligence; claim that trial court improperly failed to enforce provisions of contracts with defendant architect firm and defendant general contractor pertaining to how change orders and payment requisitions were to be initiated and processed; whether failure to follow change order procedures was raised in complaint as basis for plaintiff's count alleging breach of construction contract; whether trial court's finding that no material breach of architectural contract occurred while architect firm was still employed on project was clearly erroneous; claim that general contractor breached contract by failing to construct wall and fence in particular location and with certain specifications; whether trial court properly found that specifications and location of wall and fence were modified by subsequent agreement of parties at plaintiff's request; whether trial court's finding that architectural contract did not require architect firm to provide contract administration services was clearly erroneous; whether plaintiff demonstrated that architect firm had breached professional standard of care applicable to architects; credibility of expert witnesses; whether there was evidentiary basis for trial court's decision to reject testimony of plaintiff's expert; claim that trial court's findings regarding punch list that identified certain items of work that general contractor allegedly had left incomplete or in need of repair were clearly erroneous; claim that trial court erroneously calculated portion of retainage that plaintiff was permitted to keep for incomplete or defective work; whether trial court properly determined there was no credible evidence or economic rationale that supported taking corrective actions proposed in punch list.
- Dupigny v. Commissioner of Correction, 183 CA 852 130A
Habeas corpus; claim of ineffective assistance of trial counsel; whether habeas court properly concluded that petitioner was not prejudiced by trial counsel's performance; whether there was reasonable probability that, but for trial counsel's alleged inadequate preparation, result of criminal trial would have been different.
- Edwards v. Commissioner of Correction, 183 CA 838 116A
Habeas corpus; whether habeas court improperly denied petition for writ of habeas corpus that alleged ineffective assistance of trial counsel; claim that habeas court should have presumed, pursuant to United States v. Cronin (466 U.S. 648), that petitioner was prejudiced and, thus, granted habeas petition on ground that counsel failed to subject state's case to any meaningful adversarial testing; whether trial counsel's utter lack of advocacy on petitioner's behalf in declining to cross-examine victim and her children, and in failing to investigate petitioner's alibi, could reasonably be construed as strategic.
- Grover v. Commissioner of Correction, 183 CA 804 82A
Habeas corpus; risk of injury to child; claim that petitioner was denied constitutional right to counsel free from conflicts of interest; claim that trial counsel had financial incentive to convince petitioner to accept plea because petitioner was unable to pay trial counsel's trial retainer in full; claim that trial counsel provided ineffective

(continued on next page)

CONNECTICUT LAW JOURNAL

(ISSN 87500973)

Published by the State of Connecticut in accordance with the provisions of General Statutes § 51-216a.

Commission on Official Legal Publications
 Office of Production and Distribution
 111 Phoenix Avenue, Enfield, Connecticut 06082-4453
 Tel. (860) 741-3027, FAX (860) 745-2178
www.jud.ct.gov

RICHARD J. HEMENWAY, *Publications Director*Published Weekly – Available at <https://www.jud.ct.gov/lawjournal>

Syllabuses and Indices of court opinions by
 ERIC M. LEVINE, *Reporter of Judicial Decisions*
 Tel. (860) 757-2250

The deadline for material to be published in the Connecticut Law Journal is Wednesday at noon for publication on the Tuesday six days later. When a holiday falls within the six day period, the deadline will be noon on Tuesday.

<i>assistance by failing to retain or request funding to retain forensic mental health professional; claim that trial counsel failed to identify innocent alternative explanations for allegations against petitioner; whether habeas court abused its discretion in denying petition for certification to appeal; whether there was reasonable, strategic basis for trial counsel's decision not to seek court funding for expert; whether record supported claim that victim's foster father was possible culprit; whether trial counsel was ineffective in considering and rejecting theory advanced by petitioner.</i>	
In re Briana G., 183 CA 724	2A
<i>Termination of parental rights; whether trial court prematurely determined that respondent father had failed to achieve sufficient degree of personal rehabilitation necessary to encourage belief that he could assume responsible position in children's lives within reasonable period of time as required by statute (§ 17a-112 [j] [3] [B] [i]); claim that Department of Children and Families had not made sufficient efforts to reunify father with children; whether trial court abused its discretion in admitting into evidence transcripts of certain text messages extracted from cell phone of children's mother following her death; whether chain of custody was sufficiently established.</i>	
Martowska v. White, 183 CA 770	48A
<i>Child custody; whether trial court's postjudgment discovery order prohibiting plaintiff from accessing copy of psychological evaluation for use in unrelated proceeding constituted final judgment for purposes of appeal.</i>	
National Waste Associates, LLC v. Scharf, 183 CA 734	12A
<i>Contracts; unjust enrichment; alleged violation of Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act (CUTPA) (§ 42-110a et seq.); alleged violation of Connecticut Uniform Trade Secrets Act (CUTSA) (§ 35-50 et seq.); claim that trial court improperly concluded that unjust enrichment claims against defendant businesses were barred by existence of certain agreement between plaintiff and defendant former employee; whether trial court's finding that nonsolicitation provision in individual defendants' employment agreements with plaintiff was unenforceable as to plaintiff's prospective customers was clearly erroneous; reviewability of claim that trial court failed to address CUTPA claims that arose out of alleged misappropriation of trade secrets; claim that trial court failed to consider CUTPA claims that were unrelated to misappropriation of trade secrets; whether trial court's finding that plaintiff could not prevail on CUTPA claims was clearly erroneous.</i>	
Riccio v. Riccio, 183 CA 823	101A
<i>Dissolution of marriage; whether trial court considered appropriate statutory (§§ 46b-81 and 46b-82) factors in making its financial orders; whether trial court's findings were within its discretion; whether trial court abused its discretion in applying present division method, instead of present value method, in distributing parties' defined benefit plans; whether trial court's order requiring defendant to pay to plaintiff rehabilitative alimony constituted impermissible double dipping.</i>	
State v. Harris, 183 CA 865	143A
<i>Criminal possession of firearm; unpreserved claim that trial court violated defendant's constitutional rights to trial by jury, to fair trial and to presumption of innocence; claim that court's finding of guilt and its sentence were impermissibly based on its finding that defendant had committed murder of victim; whether evidence was insufficient to support conviction; whether there was sufficient evidence presented that defendant had physical possession or control of, or exercised dominion over, firearm.</i>	
State v. Jerzy G., 183 CA 757	35A
<i>Pretrial program of accelerated rehabilitation; sexual assault in fourth degree; motion to dismiss; whether trial court abused its discretion in finding that defendant had not successfully completed probation; whether trial court properly denied motion to dismiss criminal charge; whether trial court abused its discretion in terminating defendant's probation.</i>	
Taylor v. Taylor, 183 CA 830	108A
<i>Child visitation; whether trial court's finding that plaintiff had not established that denial of visitation with minor child of his niece would cause real and significant harm to the minor child was clearly erroneous; whether trial court properly denied petition for visitation.</i>	
Volume 183 Cumulative Table of Cases	153A
 NOTICES OF CONNECTICUT STATE AGENCIES	
State Elections Enforcement Commission	1B